

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 10-28 are pending in this application.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that Claims 10-15 and 23-28 are allowed, and that Claims 17, 18, and 22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features recited in the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement in the Patent Office on August 27, 2008. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the IDS and include a copy of the initialed and signed Form PTO/SB/08a in the next Office Action.

Claims 16 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Naoto et al. (JP 11-205063). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 16 and 19-21.

Claim 16 recites:

A noise filter for removing noise flowing in a signal wire located on a circuit board, the noise filter comprising:
an insulator;
a pair of external electrodes that are connected to the signal wire and are disposed on an outside of the insulator;
a plurality of coils connected in series, disposed inside of the insulator, and having both ends thereof electrically connected to the external electrodes, respectively; and
a capacitor connected in parallel to at least one of the plurality of coils; wherein
each of the plurality of coils includes a plurality of coil conductors disposed in the insulator, the plurality of coil conductors being arranged in a spiral configuration and connected to each other through a via hole; and
the capacitor includes the plurality of coil conductors and a capacitance-forming electrode arranged so as to be opposed to each other through the insulator, the capacitance-forming electrode being electrically connected to one of the pair of external electrodes. (emphasis added)

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's Claim 16, including the feature of "the capacitor includes the plurality of coil conductors

and a capacitance-forming electrode arranged so as to be opposed to each other through the insulator,” Applicant has been able to provide a noise filter which makes it possible to easily and reliably set a resonance frequency in each of a plurality of frequency bands and which is capable of efficiently removing noise in each of the plurality of frequency bands, and also, a noise filter which makes it possible to attain a high attenuation at each resonance frequency by reliably preventing magnetic coupling between the coils (see, for example, paragraph [0015] of the Substitute Specification).

The Examiner alleged that Naoto et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicant’s Claim 16, including the feature of “the capacitor includes the plurality of coil conductors and a capacitance-forming electrode arranged so as to be opposed to each other through the insulator, the capacitance-forming electrode being electrically connected to one of the pair of external electrodes.” The Examiner alleged that “figure 2 [of Naoto et al.] discloses a plurality figure 3 is series, shows capacitors oppose each other.” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Although not entirely clear from the Examiner’s description of the rejection of Applicant’s Claim 16, it appears that the Examiner has alleged that since Fig. 2 of Naoto et al. schematically shows a plurality of coils 14_1, 14_2 ...14_n that are each connected in parallel to a capacitor, Naoto et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicant’s Claim 16, including the feature of “the capacitor includes the plurality of coil conductors and a capacitance-forming electrode arranged so as to be opposed to each other through the insulator” as recited in Applicant’s Claim 16. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s interpretation of the teachings of Naoto et al.

The Examiner has failed to specifically point out what elements of Naoto et al. allegedly teach or suggest the features of the capacitor, the plurality of coil conductors, and the capacitance-forming electrode recited in Applicant’s Claim 16. However, as shown in Fig. 5 of Naoto et al., elements 121 and 123, which appear to correspond to capacitance-forming electrodes as recited in claim 16, are not opposed to any coil conductors **through any of the insulators** 111, 112, 113. Instead, as shown in Figs.

5(A) and 5(F) of Naoto et al., the capacitance-forming electrode 121 is disposed adjacent to a coil conductor **on the same side of the insulator 111** and the capacitance-forming electrode 123 is disposed adjacent to a coil conductor **on the same side of the insulator 113**.

In addition, as shown in Fig. 4 of Naoto et al., each of the capacitors 16_1, 16_2, and 16_3 includes two opposed capacitance-forming electrodes, and does not include any coil conductors. Each of the coil conductors 15_1, 15_2, and 15_3 of Naoto et al. is a component of the coil 15, and none of the coil conductors 15_1, 15_2, and 15_3 are components of any of the capacitors 16_1, 16_2, and 16_3.

Thus, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Naoto et al. clearly fails to teach or suggest the features of "the capacitor includes the plurality of coil conductors and a capacitance-forming electrode arranged so as to be opposed to each other through the insulator" as recited in Applicant's Claim 16.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Naoto et al.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 16 is allowable. Claims 17-22 depend upon Claim 16, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 16 is allowable. Claims 10-15 and 23-28 are allowed, as indicated by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions the Commissioner for a Two-Month Extension of Time, extending to October 30, 2008, the period for response to the Office Action dated May 30, 2008.

Application S.N. 10/596,870
October 24, 2008
Reply to the Office Action dated May 30, 2008
Page 11 of 11

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 24, 2008

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/
Attorneys for Applicant

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP
1800 Alexander Bell Drive, Suite 200
Reston, VA 20191
Telephone: (571) 313-7440
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710